

November 4, 2015

Sen. Rick Jones, Chair

Members of the Judiciary Committee

Michigan Senate

Re: SB 0581

Members of the Judiciary Committee,

I support your proposed changes to the school safety zone loitering definition in Michigan's Sex Offender Registration Act. I also support your changes related to fees/indigence, email addresses, and phone numbers. I do have 3 concerns, however.

1. As written in the bill, it appears that registrants are required to register vehicle descriptions/registration number/license plate numbers of vehicles owned by everyone at the address where the registrant resides. This is inappropriate for a number of reasons:
 - a. Non-registrants that own a car that the registrant never drives should not be subject to having their vehicle information displayed on the public website.
 - b. Making a registrant responsible for reporting vehicle description/registration number/license numbers of vehicles that are registered to the address where the registrant resides, even when they don't drive the vehicle, and having to update this whenever the owner of the vehicle decides to change their vehicle/registration/plates, places an unrealistic and impractical burden on the registrant that also infringes on the privacy of that other person. For example, as written in the bill, if a registrant is a college student and lives in a house with 5 other college students that have vehicles registered at that same address, each of those vehicles must be registered, and every time one of the other 5 students changes vehicles or plates registered to that address, the registrant has a duty to report this the next time they go register. **This will surely meet with the disapproval of the court-- both from the perspective of the non-registrant having information placed on the registry for a vehicle the registrant doesn't even drive, and from the perspective of the registrant who would be expected to manage the complexity of registering information about vehicle changes that are not within the registrants control, that may even change frequently.**
2. I encourage Michigan to **remove the School Safety Zone residency restrictions in the MSORA.** The SMART Office (U.S. Department of Justice) SOMAPI project published the following findings and recommendations (http://smart.gov/SOMAPI/exec_summ.html) :

"Residency restrictions. Restrictions that prevent convicted sex offenders from living near schools, daycare centers, and other places where children congregate have generally had no deterrent effect on sexual reoffending, particularly against children. In fact, studies have revealed that proximity to schools and other places where children congregate had little relation to where offenders met child victims...SOMAPI forum participants do not recommend

expanding the residency restriction policy." (Note: the Federal Adam Walsh Act does not have a residency restriction policy, and the recommendation is that there not be one.)

3. **Persons registering solely because of a juvenile offense should not be subject to any School Safety Zone requirements.** A juvenile offender's greatest risk for re-offense is in the months immediately following when their offense occurred, when they have not yet been treated. Even at that time, these offenders are allowed to attend school and participate in school activities. It makes no sense to subject them to School Safety Zone restrictions years later when they have matured into adulthood when they are even less likely to reoffend (this has been proven by research). **The MSORA should be changed to remove the School Safety Zone requirement of individuals registering solely for a juvenile offense.**

Thank you for your consideration of these issues and requests.



Sharon Denniston, Juvenile Advocate
Ph.D. Candidate in Public Policy
Illumine Research, Analysis, and Consulting